



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,102	08/26/2003	Kim Ngoc Vu	C1138-700110	6429

7590 03/06/2007
Robert A. Skrivanek, Jr.
Lowrie, Lando & Anastasi, LLP
One Main Street
Cambridge, MA 02142

EXAMINER

FOX, JOHN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3753

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/650,102

Applicant(s)

VU, KIM NGOC

Examiner

John Fox

Art Unit

3753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2006 and 17 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 18-34 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 17, 35, 36 and 38-41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The application has been forwarded to the examiner by the 3700 SPRE Shop (via SPRE Henry C. Yuen) to construe the petitions filed Nov. 17, 2006 as a request for reconsideration. Upon review and consideration, prosecution is reopened and a new Office action set forth below. The finality of the last office action is withdrawn.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-15 and 18-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eidsmore et al '546, of record, in view of Ohmi et al '871.

Eidsmore et al show a gas stick system with substrates 40 having transverse channels 41 which take manifolds, or bridge fittings in the language of the patent, to make connections between adjacent sticks. In the embodiment of Figure 7, such transverse manifolds include the end fittings labeled 46, which has a port in a plane transverse to the top plane which contains the ports communicating with the components. Eidsmore et al show in Figure 7 a four bolt mounting pattern for the three way and two way valves. Eidsmore et al, though, use bridge fittings for the gas sticks on the inlet side of the MFC. Ohmi et al show another gas stick where the inlet side of the MFC can be either a substrate/manifold or an integral block. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used an integral block instead of the substrate/manifold in Eidsmore et al, as for the inlet side of the MFC, in view of the equivalence taught by Ohmi et al.

Applicant's arguments have been considered at great length, and fully answered in the record, and are no more persuasive now than in the past. The claimed device is a step back in the art from Eidsmore et al and falls squarely within the ambit of §103. Ohmi et al '871 discloses all

Art Unit: 3753

that Ohmi et al '933 does and is more than adequate to justify a conclusion that the claims are obvious.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eidsmore et al in view of Ohmi et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Symington.

Eidsmore et al, as modified, teach the claimed device except for testing for leakage. Symington teaches a gas stick apparatus including a base plate with means to test the apparatus for a gas leak. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used such a base plate with the device of Eidsmore et al, as modified, to provide for leak testing therein.

Claims 16-17, 35-36, and 38-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-4912. The examiner can normally be reached on Patent Hoteling Program.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Keasel can be reached on 571-272-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



John Fox

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3753